

PATENT

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action dated September 23, 2005. Claims 1-31 were examined, all of which were rejected. Claims 1-31 remain present in the case.

In the present Office Action: Applicants' specification was objected to for including an Express Mail Label at the top of page 1; claims 1, 12 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,306,967 (hereinafter "Dow"); and claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,542 (hereinafter "Lin"). With respect to the objection to the specification for including an Express Mail Label, Applicants respectfully request clarification on the basis for the objection. Moreover, Applicants respectfully note that 37 C.F.R. §1.10 specifically requires placement of the Express Mail number on correspondence filed with the USPTO in order to ensure receiving the USPS deposit date as the filing date for the correspondence.


Applicants have amended claims 1-3, 5, 12-14, 16, 22-24 and 26. More specifically, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 12 and 22 to essentially incorporate the subject matter of dependent claims 2, 13 and 23, respectively. Applicants have amended dependent claims 3 and 5 to depend upon claim 1 (instead of claim 2), dependent claims 14 and 16 to depend upon claim 12 (instead of claim 13) and dependent claims 24 and 26 to depend upon claim 22 (instead of claim 23). Applicants submit that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the Applicants' specification, as filed. Specifically, support for the amendments to claims 2, 13 and 23 may be found at, for example, page 5, lines 14-15 and page 6, lines 3-8 (see Applicants' Fig. 2).

With respect to the rejection of Applicants' independent claims 1, 12 and 22 (as applied to original claims 2, 13 and 23), as amended, Applicants agree that Dow does not teach or suggest storing a second digital signal in a buffer along a second signal path. However, Applicants respectfully disagree that Lin teaches storing a second digital signal in a buffer along a second signal path and also re-inverting a first digital signal at a final destination, as is set forth in claims 1, 12 and 22 (as amended), in one form or another. That is, while Lin discloses the use of buffers, Applicants note that Lin buffers all paths (when buffers are implemented) and

PATENT

specifically discloses the utilization of inverters in even numbers (see for example Figs. 1 and 2), which, in fact, teaches away from Applicants' claimed subject matter (i.e., re-inverting a signal at a final destination). Thus, at least in this regard, Lin and Dow are mutually exclusive. For at least these reasons, independent claims 1, 12 and 22, as amended, are allowable over a combination of Lin and Dow. Additionally, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-31 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend upon an allowable claim.

In summary, claims 1-31 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.	
 Michael R. Long	<u>11-21-05</u> Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Long, Reg. No. 42,808
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6324 (direct)
(512) 338-6300 (main)
(512) 338-6301 (fax)